

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 3-8 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled and claim 9 has been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-9 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added.

Objections

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the Office Action noted that "S105" which appears in Figure 4 was not mentioned in the text of the specification.

The paragraph starting on page 34, line 4, of the specification has been amended to use reference numeral S105. It is submitted that no new matter has been added by the changes to this paragraph, because it would have been readily apparent that the operations illustrated in Fig. 4 were being described, due to the presence of "S101" in this paragraph, and "S105" was added to the paragraph in conformance to what is shown in Fig. 4.

In paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as containing an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser executable code. The paragraph beginning on the last line of page 1 has been amended to remove "http://" from the URLs of the websites. If this change is insufficient to overcome the objection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone or explain in the next Office Action what additional changes are required.

In paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 6 as being ambiguous. Claim 6 has been amended to address the ambiguity, and, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 6 has overcome the objection.

In paragraph 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 8 due to informalities. Claim 8 has been amended to address the informalities, and, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 8 has overcome the objection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all objections.

Rejections

In paragraphs 8-11 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 2 has been cancelled and therefore the rejection in paragraph 9 is moot. Claims 1 and 3-8 have been amended in response to the § 112, second

paragraph rejections. If the Examiner does not agree that claims 1 and 3-8 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone **prior to issuance of another Office Action** to arrange an Interview during which any remaining indefiniteness issues can be resolved prior to further examination.

In paragraph 13 on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 5-8 have been amended in response to the § 101 rejections. In particular, claim 8 has been amended to clarify that all elements are recited as means-plus-function elements. It is submitted that these elements have easily understood corresponding structure described in the specification as physical components and therefore, claim 8 is directed to a statutory class of subject matter.

If the Examiner does not agree that claims 5-8 recite patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone **prior to issuance of another Office Action** to arrange an Interview during which any remaining issues related to § 101 can be resolved prior to further examination.

In item 15 on pages 7-11 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,539).

Miller et al. is directed to a method and system for retrieving search results from multiple disparate databases. Specifically, Miller et al. describes a system managing and controlling authentication when databases 18a-h are accessed by translators 16a-h. Each translator 16 needs to establish an authenticated session with the corresponding database 18 before submitting a search request to its corresponding database 18 (see column 8, lines 30-35). Since each database 18 is different, the translator 16 performs the authentication task accordingly. There are three methods the translator disclosed by Miller et al. can use for authentication. One method of authentication is by the translator using an ID and a password login (see column 8, lines 39-43). A second method for authenticating is by performing Internet Protocol authentication where the database only accepts connections from clients with specific Internet addresses, such as a library or corporate network used by a subscriber (see column 8, lines 53-64). A third method for authentication is used by a system having an authentication manager that accesses user authentication information in the database (see column 8, line 65 to column 9, line 8).

On the other hand, claim 1 is able to successfully submit requests to "information retrieval sites that require authentication and **restrict number of accesses**" (claim 1, lines 13-

14, emphasis added). A description of such information retrieval sites is provided on page 16 of the specification. The method recited in claim 1 includes, "recording a process ID into the ID information of one of the sets of the authentication information when the authentication information in the one of the sets is used to access a corresponding information retrieval site" (claim 1, lines 16-18) and "transmitting, to the one of said information retrieval sites, the authentication information in the corresponding set of the authentication information and the ID information when the ID information in the corresponding set is blank" (claim 1, lines 22-24). An example of these operations is summarized on page 6, lines 1-10 and described in more detail on pages 27-31 of the specification. Nothing has been cited or found in Miller et al. that teaches or suggests any concern regarding the number of accesses to a database, or any method that can prevent sending an excess numbers of accesses to a database. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Miller et al.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and inherit the patentable features thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 and 4 patentably distinguish over Miller et al.

Independent claims 5 and 8 have been amended to recite limitation similar to those quoted above with respect to independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 8, as well as claim 6 which depends from claim 5, patentably distinguish over Miller et al. at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Similarly, independent claim 7 has been amended to recite, "identifying authentication information whose ID information is blank corresponding to the one of said information retrieval sites among predetermined sets of the authentication information and ID information that require authentication and restrict number of accesses, the authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said information retrieval sites" (claim 7, lines 12-16) and "transmitting, to the one of said information retrieval sites, the authentication information in a corresponding set of the authentication information and the ID information when the ID information in the corresponding set is blank" (claim 7, lines 20-22). Thus, independent claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Miller et al. for reasons similar to these discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

New Claim

Claim 9 recites

storing predetermined sets of authentication information and ID information for each of said information retrieval sites that requires authentication and that

restrict number of accesses, the authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said information retrieval sites (claim 9, lines 4-8). However, as mentioned above, nothing has been cited or found in Miller et al. that teaches or suggests the restricting number of accesses to a database. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Miller et al.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 24, 2007

By: /Richard A. Gollhofer/
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501